

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-15 are pending. Claims 1, 11, and 12 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) on Noda (US 2003/0128387). This rejection is traversed.

Claim 1 is directed to a network scanner device for transmitting image data through a network. The device includes a storage section in which sender e-mail addresses and mail titles are stored in association with each other, the sender e-mail addresses being distinct from a sending station address specifying the network scanner device. The device also includes a second setting section for, when a sender e-mail address and mail title is selected, setting up the selected sender e-mail address in place of the sending station address. A transmission control section carries out control for adding the sender e-mail address and the mail title set by the second setting section to an email for transmitting the image data, the mail title being set as the title of the email, and transmitting the email with the image data to the recipient address set by the first setting section.

Noda fails to disclose or suggest a transmission control section that carries out control for adding the sender e-mail address and the mail title set by the second setting section to an email for transmitting the image data, the mail title being set as the title of the email, and transmitting the email with the image data to the recipient address set by the first setting sections, as claimed. The Examiner contends that any of Noda's e-mail registration descriptions, such as an IP address, an e-mail address, a name, or a data ID, can be interpreted as the claimed mail titles. See Action, page 3. Applicants have clarified that the mail title set by the second setting section is added to an email for transmitting the image data, the mail title being set as the title of the email. None of Noda's alleged e-mail registration description information is set as the title of an email for transmitting image data, as claimed.

In view of the above, the invention defined by claim 1 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Noda. Claim 1 is thus allowable. Claims 11 and 12 recite similar features as claim 1 and are allowable for similar reasons. The remaining claims are allowable due to their dependency on an allowable base claim. Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the outstanding rejection and issue a Notice of Allowance.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicants petition for any required relief, including extensions of time, and authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing Docket No. **204552031700**.

Dated: November 14, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Jonathan Bockman

Registration No. 45,640  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 400  
McLean, Virginia 22102  
(703) 760-7769